



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,680	01/25/2002	Teddy Kosoglou	CV01492K	9993
24265	7590	06/04/2007	EXAMINER	
SCHERING-PLough CORPORATION PATENT DEPARTMENT (K-6-1, 1990) 2000 GALLOPING HILL ROAD KENILWORTH, NJ 07033-0530			HUI, SAN MING R	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1617		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/04/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/056,680	KOSOGLOU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	San-ming Hui	1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-17,21-45,47 and 48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-10,12-17,21-34,38-41 and 48 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3,35-37,42-45 and 47 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-16-07</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on march 9, 2007 has been entered.

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-17, 21-45, 47-48 are pending. Claims 4-10, 12-17, 21-34, 38-41, and 48 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1, 3, 35-37, 42-45, and 47 have been examined herein to the extent they read on the elected invention and species.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1617

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 3, 35-37, 42-45, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenblum et al. (EP 0720 599, reference CA from IDS received January 21, 2003), and Ullah (WO 99/47123 from IDS received January 21, 2003) in view of Frei (Proc Soc Exp Biol Med. 1999 Dec; 222(3): 196-204).

Rosenblum et al. teaches a composition comprising the compound of Formula (II), lactose, and magnesium stearate (See particularly claims 8, and 9, page 24, example 6, page 29, Examples A and B). Rosenblum et al. also teaches the active compounds therein, including the racemic mixture of compound of Formula (II), can be formulated into a tablet (See Example A and B in page 29). Rosenblum et al. also teaches the effective dosage of compound of Formula (II) as 5 to 1000mg per day (See page 17, paragraph 0065). Rosenblum et al. also teaches the active compounds therein can be combined with HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors, preferably simvastatin, for reducing cholesterol and the risk of atherosclerosis (See 5, paragraph 0028, also claims 16 and 17).

Ullah teaches a composition comprising statins, such as simvastatin, in combination with aspirin, for cholesterol lowering and treating or reducing the risk of developing atherosclerosis (See the abstract, also page 1, lines 14-18). Ullah teaches the dosage for aspirin as 50-650mg (See page 5, lines 34-37).

The primary references do not expressly teach the composition comprising the compound of formula (II) herein, aspirin, and simvastatin together. The primary

references do not expressly teach antioxidants be incorporated into the composition containing compound of formula (II) herein, aspirin, and simvastatin.

Frei teaches antioxidants, such as vitamin C and vitamin E, as useful in inhibit the atherogensis and normalize the vascular functions (See the abstract, page 198, col. 2, second paragraph, also page 199, col. 1, second paragraph, page 201, col. 2, first paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the compound of Rosenblum into the composition of Ullah. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate antioxidant into the composition containing compound of formula (II) herein, aspirin, and simvastatin.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the compound of Rosenblum into the composition of Ullah. Combining composition of Rosenblum and that of Ullah, which are known to be useful to reduce cholesterol level and the risk of atherosclerosis individually, into a single composition useful for the very same purpose is *prima facie* obvious. See *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate antioxidant into the composition containing compound of formula (II) herein, aspirin, and simvastatin. Vitamin C, an antioxidant, is known as useful to inhibit the development of atherosclerosis. Combining vitamin C with composition containing compounds of Rosenblum and Ullah, which are known to be useful to reduce cholesterol level and the

risk of atherosclerosis individually, into a single composition useful for the very same purpose is *prima facie* obvious. See *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments averring the unexpected results, along with the declaration by Dr. Chintala, filed January 9, 2007 have been considered, but are not found persuasive. Examiner notes that it is applicant's burden to demonstrate unexpected results over the prior art. See MPEP 716.02, also 716.02 (a) - (g). Furthermore, the unexpected results should be demonstrated with evidence that the differences in results are in fact unexpected and unobvious and of both statistical and practical significance. *Ex parte Gelles*, 22 USPQ2d 1318, 1319 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992). Moreover, evidence as to any unexpected benefits must be "clear and convincing" *In re Lohr*, 137 USPQ 548 (CCPA 1963), and be of a scope reasonably commensurate with the scope of the subject matter claimed, *In re Linder*, 173 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1972). In the instant case, the dosage claimed is not commensurate with the dosage used in the experiment. There is only one single dosage used for aspirin and one dosage for ezetimibe and yet the claims recite a very large range of both agents. It is not clear how one single dosage can extrapolate to a vast range of active. There is no rationale as to how the dosage of ezetimibe be expanded to a broad range as claimed. The rationale for expanding the dosage of aspirin is not convincing. Various references were cited in attempt to provide reasoning for the range of dosage recited in the claims; however, the herein claimed dosage range is not the normal dosage range for antiplatelet activity.

Rather, it should be corresponding to the unexpected benefit of antiplatelet activities demonstrated in Dr. Davis' declaration filed November 5, 2005, and not the normal antiplatelet activities of aspirin.

Applicant's arguments filed January 9, 2007 averring the lack of motivation provided by the cited prior arts have been considered, but are not found persuasive. As discussed many times before, the motivation to combine the teachings of the cited prior arts is based on the fact that the herein claimed agents are known to be useful in reducing the risk of cardiovascular diseases such as atherosclerosis. Therefore, combining these agents into a single composition useful for the very same purpose would be considered obvious, absent evidence to the contrary (See *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069). Examiner notes that the basis to combine is not based on the agents having same mechanism of action. The basis is rather they are known to have the same therapeutical use in the art. Applicant's remarks with regard to some of the claims do not require the presence of an optional agent such as statin is acknowledged. Examiner notes that although some of the claims do not require statin, they do not exclude them neither. Therefore, possessing the teachings of the cited prior arts, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the herein claimed actives into a single composition useful for the very same purpose (See *Kerkhoven supra*).

No claims are allowed.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to San-ming Hui whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 1617

0626. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 9:00 to 1:00, Tu - Fri from 9:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, PhD., can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


San-ming Hui
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617